DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 476 CE 026 836

AUTHOR Martin, Robert A.
TITLE Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques to the Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Dept. of Agricultural Education.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 80
CONTRACT 83-9817
NOTE 85p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Evaluation; *Agricultural Education; *Beginning Teachers; Educational Research; *Management by Objectives; *Performance; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Success; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision; Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

A study tested the effects of two systems of supervisory techniques--product specification and process specification--on the success of beginning teachers of vocational agriculture. (Product specification is based on supervision-by-objectives, a student-centered emphasis. Process specification is based on management of the teacher and his/her activities, a teacher-centered emphasis.) It was hypothesized that supervisory techniques based on product specifications would be more effective. The study used an experimental, posttest-only control group design. Data consisted of measures from each of the following groups: principals, teachers, and students. Findings indicated no significant differences in (1) the success of teachers being supervised through the two systems (Student Perception of Teacher Style Survey), (2) student achievement test scores, (3) supervisor effectiveness scores (as rated by teachers on Likert Profile of a School survey for supervisors), (4) supervisor behavior ratings (as perceived by teachers on Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire for principals), (5) supervisor effectiveness ratings regarding goals and objectives (as perceived by teachers on Job Objectives Questionnaires), and (6) supervisor effectiveness scores (obtained by self-rating using three measures). (Appendixes, amounting to approximately three-fourths of the report, contain study materials and questionnaires.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193476

10/24/80

Final Report

Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques to the Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture

Contract No. 83-9817

Robert A. Martin

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

September 30, 1980

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Research Coordinating Unit
for Vocational Education

CE 026 836

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Ford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
II.	INTRODUCTORY SECTION	2
	Abstract	2
	Objectives	2
	Outcomes	2
	Audience	3
	Publications and Available Materials	3
	Background	3
	Statement of the Problem	3
III.	METHODS	5
	Hypotheses	5
	Procedures	5
	Research Design	6
IV.	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	8
V.	SUMMARY	9
VI.	CONCLUSIONS	17
	Outcomes	17
	Recommendations for Further Study	18
VII.	SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS	19

I. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to Dr. David Howell, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education; Dr. Samuel Curtis, Professor of Agricultural Education; Dr. Gene Love, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture; Dr. Patrick Lynch, Professor of Educational Administration; Dr. Susan Weis, Associate Professor of Home Economics Education; and Dr. Edgar Yoder, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education, The Pennsylvania State University, for their contributions to this study.

Appreciation is also offered to the following: the high school principals and area vocational technical school administrators, vocational agriculture teachers and vocational agriculture students in Pennsylvania who participated in this study.

II. INTRODUCTORY SECTION

Abstract

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
School Unit 4-10-14-720-1
Contract No. 83-9817

Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques to the Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture

Robert A. Martin
Department of Agricultural Education
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
814-863-0443

$2000.00

January 1, 1980-
June 30, 1980

The purpose of this study was to determine if using selected supervisory techniques would contribute to the success of beginning teachers of vocational agriculture.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To determine the effectiveness of beginning teachers of agriculture when supervised in a system of performance and product specification.

2. To determine the effect on student achievement when beginning teachers and their supervisors evaluate teacher performance on the basis of objectives and goals.

3. To determine the need for school administrators to supervise beginning teachers on the basis of the objectives and goals that are set and achieved.

4. To determine the effect on the working climate when beginning teachers are supervised on the basis of performance and product specification.

Outcomes

The principals and teachers randomly selected for participation in this experimental study used supervisory techniques and strategies based upon two systems of supervision--product specification and process specification. The results suggest that there are significant differences in

the ratings of the two systems of supervision as perceived by principals, beginning teachers of vocational agriculture, and vocational agriculture students in Pennsylvania high schools and area vocational-technical schools.

Principals using product specification supervision (supervision-by-objectives) followed these five steps:

1. Pre-observational Conference
2. Observation
3. Analysis
4. Post-observation Conference
5. Critique

Instructional materials concerning conservation of energy in agriculture were field tested.

Audience

The resulting reports are useful to administrators of vocational education programs, vocational education teachers, and teacher educators in agricultural education as well as other vocational subject areas.

Publications and Available Materials (to date and those projected)

A. To Date

1. Final Report

B. Projected

1. Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques to the Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture, Ph.D. Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, May 1981.

2. Paper to be presented at AATEA American Agricultural Teacher Educators Association, Research Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, December 5, 1980.

Background

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine if using selected supervisory techniques would contribute to the success of beginning teachers of vocational agriculture.

Two systems of supervision were tested in this experiment: product specification and process specification. Product specification is defined as a supervisory system based on supervision-by-objectives. Goals and

objectives are clearly defined by the teacher and communicated both to the supervisor and the students. Because supervision-by-objectives is student-centered emphasis is placed on the "product" of the learning situation. Users of the product specification system attempt to determine what the learner can do as a result of the teaching and learning. Process specification is defined as a supervisory system based on management of the teacher and his/her activities. Standard procedures are prescribed by school administrators and supervisors. Because process specification is teacher-centered, emphasis is placed on what the teacher does or does not do prior to and during the teaching process.

A review of the literature makes it clear that beginning teachers as a group have unique needs and problems. Lortie (1975) noted that compared with beginning many other forms of work, entry into teaching differs markedly. There appears to be no eased entry such as occurs in an apprenticeship, nor does there appear to be a sharing of entry experiences with more mature, longer-serving colleagues. From being students responsible only to themselves for their own learning, almost overnight beginning teachers become fully responsible for the instruction of their pupils from the first working day. An expectation seems to be that they should perform the same tasks on the same level as the 25-year veteran.

Harrington (1961) supported this view when he stated:

> Undoubtedly the greatest pitfall for the beginning teacher is the lack of supervision. If supervision stands for the improvement of instruction, the work must begin with the novice and continue in a planned program until he is professionally mature and able to stand alone.

Several educational researchers (Fyfield, 1978; Tisher, 1978; Lortie, 1975; Anderton, 1976) emphatically agree that inservice education is needed to help those responsible for the successful induction of beginning teachers.

III. METHODS

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the study were as follows:

1. Teachers being supervised through a system of product specification will have greater success in teaching than teachers supervised through a system of process specification as perceived by students on the Student Perception of Teacher Style Survey (SPOTS).

2. Students will score higher on an achievement test when teachers and supervisors evaluate teacher performance using a system of product specification supervision than in a system of process specification supervision.

3. Supervisor effectiveness scores as rated by beginning teachers on the Likert Profile of a School Survey will be higher for supervisors using product specification supervision than those scores of supervisors using process specification supervision.

4. Supervisory behavior ratings of administrators as perceived by beginning teachers on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire will be higher for the principals using product specification than for the principals using process specification.

5. Supervisors placing emphasis on supervision-by-objectives will rate higher in effectiveness concerning goals and objectives than supervisors placing emphasis on teacher activity as perceived by beginning teachers on the Job Objectives Questionnaire.

6. Supervisor effectiveness scores obtained by self-rating on the Likert Profile of a School Survey, the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire, and the Job Objectives Questionnaire will be higher for supervisors using product specification supervision than for supervisors using process specification supervision.

Procedures

Two randomly selected groups of principals or supervisors having beginning teachers of agriculture in their schools participated in workshops on selected supervisory techniques. There was a total population of 40 Pennsylvania schools from which to randomly select the 28 participants. These schools were located throughout Pennsylvania. There were

ten area vocational-technical schools and 18 comprehensive high schools (Appendices B, C, D, E, F, G). Fourteen attended a workshop at which product specification supervisory techniques were stressed (Appendices H, I). Fourteen others attended a workshop at which process specification supervisory techniques were emphasized (Appendices H, I, O, P, Q, R, S, T).

The supervisors agreed to follow specified supervisory strategies and maintain a log of activities (Appendices I, J, K, L, M, N). All teachers (28) participating in the study received an instructional packet entitled Energy Conservation in the Home and on the Farm (Howell, 1980). This packet included a teacher's manual and sufficient copies of the student manual for all students (385). A student achievement test was given at the conclusion of the instructional unit (Appendix Y5). Students completed a survey concerning their perceptions of the teacher's style of teaching (Appendix Y4). Additionally, teachers and administrators in both groups completed a post-experimental evaluation of the respective supervisory systems (Appendices W, X, Y1, Y2, Y3).

The dependent variables in this study were supervisory effectiveness, teaching success, student achievement, and supervisory behaviors. These variables were measured by the following instruments:

1. Student Achievement Test--A fifty-question cognitive knowledge test concerning conservation of energy based on the instructional unit (Appendix Y5).

2. Student Perception of Teacher Style--A sixteen-item instrument developed to measure teacher style (Appendix Y4).

3. Likert Profile of a School--An instrument developed to measure elements of support, goal emphasis, team building, work facilitation, receptivity to ideas, and decision making (Appendix Y3).

4. Job Objectives Questionnaire--An instrument developed to measure clarity of objectives, control over resources, participation, reward, and commitment (Appendix Y2).

5. Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire--An instrument developed to measure management's emphasis on job-tasks and the people that perform these tasks (Appendix Y1).

Research Design

The study was an experimental posttest only control group design. A diagram of the design is presented below:

Research Design Diagram

Experimental--posttest only control group design

R	X_1	O_1
R	X_0	O_2

28 Randomly Selected
School Principals

14 Experimental Randomly Assigned	14 Control Randomly Assigned
1 Beginning Vo. Ag. Teacher in Each School	1 Beginning Vo. Ag. Teacher in Each School
Jr-Sr Vo. Ag. Students	Jr-Sr Vo. Ag. Students
Energy Conservation	Energy Conservation

R represents the randomized treatment and control groups. The experimental group and control group school administrators attended a workshop to develop supervisory techniques.

Both the control group and experimental group administrators received instructional materials for their beginning agriculture teachers to use in their classes.

The major treatment or independent variable in the study was product specification supervisory techniques and process specification supervisory techniques.

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data for this study consisted of measures from each of the following groups: principals, teachers, and students. The experimental unit consisted of principals, teachers, and students in a system using product specification supervision. The control unit consisted of principals, teachers, and students in a system using process specification supervision. Ratings and scores for each individual were combined by groups and the resulting mean measures were statistically analyzed.

Each of the research hypotheses was individually analyzed. In each case the respective research hypothesis was stated in the form of the null hypothesis. An alpha risk of $p < .05$ was stated, the appropriate t-statistic was calculated, the critical value obtained, and the decision was then made to either reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis if the significant findings supported the research hypothesis or to fail to reject the null and reject the research hypothesis.

The data for testing each of the hypotheses were analyzed and interpreted separately.

Hypothesis one was analyzed by comparing the post-evaluation ratings (Student Perception of Teacher Style) of the two groups of students in a t-test.

Hypothesis two was analyzed by comparing the posttest scores (achievement test) of the two groups of students in a t-test.

Hypothesis three was analyzed by comparing the post-evaluation ratings (Likert Profile of a School) of the two groups of teachers in a t-test.

Hypothesis four was analyzed by comparing the post-evaluation ratings (Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire) of the two groups of teachers in a t-test.

Hypothesis five was analyzed by comparing the post-evaluation ratings (Job Objectives Questionnaire) of the two groups of teachers in a t-test.

Hypothesis six was analyzed by comparing the post-evaluation self-ratings (Job Objectives Questionnaire, Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire, and Likert Profile of a School Survey) of the two groups of principals in a t-test.

The Job Objectives Questionnaire and the Supervisory Behavior Questionnaire contain questions that require reverse scoring. Therefore it must be pointed out that a <u>lower</u> mean score indicates a higher positive action by principals/supervisors on several of the subscales of these questionnaires.

V. SUMMARY

Results regarding each of the hypotheses are presented in table form followed by an appropriate narrative.

Table 1. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings by Students on the Student Perception of Teacher Style Survey (SPOTS) in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	219	89.37	21.52	218	1.39*
Process Specification	166	83.63	18.22	165	
TOTALS	385	86.50	19.87	383	

*p = .02

Table 1 indicates that a t-value (t = 1.39, p = .02 was calculated and that the null hypothesis was rejected.

Therefore, students in vocational agriculture programs lead by beginning teachers involved in a product specification supervisory system scored significantly higher on the Student Perception of Teacher Style Survey (SPOTS) than those students in vocational agriculture programs lead by beginning teachers involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 1, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning teachers in this study resulted in a significant difference in student ratings of teachers regarding teaching style.

Table 2. Mean Scores on a Student Achievement Test on Energy Conservation in Agriculture by Type of Instructional Supervisory System.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	217	25.90	8.49	216	1.68*
Process Specification	153	24.61	6.55	152	
TOTALS	370	25.25	7.52	368	

*p = .0007

Table 2 indicates that a t-value (t = 1.68, p = .0007) was calculated and that the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, students in vocational agriculture programs taught by beginning vocational agriculture teachers in Pennsylvania involved in a product specification supervisory system will score significantly higher on an achievement test on Energy Conservation in Agriculture than those students in vocational agriculture programs taught by beginning teachers involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 2, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators with beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study resulted in a significant difference in student achievement (product) on a cognitive test.

Table 3. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Supervisors by Beginning Teachers on the Likert Profile of a School Survey in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	17	454.58	101.85	11	2.83
Process Specification	15	427.27	60.53	14	
TOTALS	27	440.93	81.19	25	

p = .07

Table 3 indicates that a t-value was calculated ($t = 2.83$, $p > .05$) and that the null hypothesis was not rejected because the calculated t was less than the value needed to reject the null. It should be pointed out, however, that the results obtained approach significance at the .07 level.

Therefore, beginning teachers of agriculture involved in a product specification supervisory system did not score significantly higher on the Likert Profile of a School Survey than those beginning vocational agriculture teachers involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 3, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study did not result in a significant difference in the ratings of the supervisory systems as perceived by these beginning teachers. However, the differences are sufficient to warrant further analysis using the various subscales of the Likert Profile of a School instrument. The difference is approaching significance at the .07 level.

Table 4. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Supervisory Systems by Beginning Teachers on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	12	112.50	18.60	11	2.19
Process Specification	15	120.00	12.56	14	
TOTALS	27	116.25	15.58	25	

$p = .168$

Table 4 indicates that a t-value was calculated ($t = 2.19$, $p > .05$) and that the null hypothesis was not rejected because the calculated t was less than the value needed to reject the null.

Therefore, beginning teachers of agriculture involved in a product specification supervisory system did not score significantly higher on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire than those beginning teachers of vocational agriculture involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 4, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study did not result in a significant difference in the ratings of the supervisory systems as perceived by these beginning teachers.

Table 5. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Supervisory Systems by Beginning Teachers on the Job Objectives Questionnaire in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	12	66.67	12.76	11	1.21
Process Specification	15	62.93	14.02	14	
TOTALS	27	64.80	13.39	25	

$p = .76$

Table 5 indicates that a t-value was calculated ($t = 1.21$, $p > .05$) and that the null hypothesis was not rejected because the calculated t was less than the value needed to reject the null.

Therefore, beginning teachers of vocational agriculture involved in a product specification supervisory system did not score significantly higher on the Job Objectives Questionnaire than those beginning teachers of vocational agriculture involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 5, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study did not result in a significant difference in the ratings of the supervisory systems as perceived by the beginning teachers.

Table 6. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Ratings by Supervisors on the Likert Profile of a School Survey Form in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	14	575.43	79.48	13	1.71
Process Specification	12	589.58	60.85	11	
TOTALS	26	582.50	70.17	24	

p = .382

Table 6 indicates that a t-value was calculated ($t = 1.71$, $p > .05$) and that the null hypothesis was not rejected because the calculated t was less than the value needed to reject the null.

Therefore, principals/supervisors involved in a product specification supervisory system did not score significantly higher on the Likert Profile of a School Survey Form than those principals/supervisors involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 6, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study did not result in a significant difference in the ratings of the supervisory systems as perceived by the principals/supervisors.

Table 7. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Ratings by Supervisors on the Job Objectives Questionnaire in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	
Product Specification	14	75.50	6.05	13	1.16
Process Specification	12	74.50	6.50	11	
TOTALS	26	75.00	6.28	24	

p = .793

Table 7 indicates that a t-value was calculated ($t = 1.16$, $p > .05$) and that the null hypothesis was not rejected because the calculated t was less than the value needed to reject the null.

Therefore, principals/supervisors involved in a product specification supervisory system did not score significantly higher on the Job Objectives Questionnaire than those principals/supervisors involved in a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 7, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study did not result in a significant difference in the ratings of the supervisory systems as perceived by the principals/supervisors.

Table 8. Composite Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Ratings by Supervisors on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire in Product and Process Specification Supervisory Systems.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	t
Product Specification	14	103.43	8.93	13	4.02*
Process Specification	12	104.25	17.91	11	
TOTALS	26	103.84	13.42	24	

*p = .02

Table 8 indicates that a t-value was calculated ($t = 4.02$, $p < .05$) and that the null hypothesis was rejected because the calculated t was greater than the value needed to reject the null.

It must be pointed out that a lower mean score indicates a higher positive action by principals/supervisors because of reverse scoring on scales used on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire.

Therefore, principals/supervisors using a product specification supervisory system scored significantly different on the Supervisory Development Questionnaire than those principals/supervisors using a process specification supervisory system.

From the data in Table 8, it can be concluded that the different supervisory systems used by school administrators and beginning vocational agriculture teachers in this study resulted in a significant difference in the ratings of the supervisory systems as perceived by the principals/supervisors.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Outcomes

The findings derived from this study are presented in the same order as the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1--there are no significant differences in the success of teachers being supervised through a system of product specification versus teachers supervised through a system of process specification as perceived by students on the Student Perception of Teacher Style Survey (SPOTS)--was rejected. Mean ratings for the two student groups were found to be significantly different ($t = 1.39$, $p = .02$) (Table 1).

Hypothesis 2--there are no significant differences in student achievement test scores when teachers and supervisors evaluate teacher performance using product specification supervision versus process specification supervision--was rejected. Mean scores for the two groups on the achievement test were found to be significantly different ($t = 1.68$, $p = .0007$) (Table 2).

Hypothesis 3--there are no significant differences in supervisor effectiveness scores as rated by beginning vocational agriculture teachers on the Likert Profile of a School Survey for supervisors using product specification versus supervisors using process specification--was not rejected ($t = 2.83$, $p = .07$) (Table 3). Although these scores did not reach significance at the .05 level acceptable for this study, the scores do suggest that the implications of the differences that were obtained merit discussion.

Hypothesis 4--there are no significant differences in supervisor behavior ratings as perceived by beginning vocational agriculture teachers on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire (SBDQ) for principals using product specification versus principals using process specification--was not rejected. Mean ratings of teachers on the SBDQ were not found to be significantly different between experimental and control groups ($t = 2.19$, $p = 1.68$) (Table 4).

Hypothesis 5--there are no significant differences in supervisor effectiveness ratings regarding goals and objectives as perceived by beginning vocational agriculture teachers on the Job Objectives Questionnaire (JOQ) for supervisors using product specification supervision versus supervisors using process specification supervision--was not rejected. Mean ratings of teachers on the JOQ were not found to be significantly different between the experimental and control groups ($t = 1.21$, $p = .76$) (Table 5).

Hypothesis 6--there are no significant differences in supervisor effectiveness scores obtained by self-rating on the Likert Profile of a School Survey, the Job Objectives Questionnaire and the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire for supervisors using product specification supervision versus supervisors using process specification supervision--a. was not rejected for self-ratings on the Likert Profile of a School Survey ($t = 1.71$, $p = .382$) (Table 6).

b. was not rejected for self-ratings on the Job Objectives Questionnaire ($t = 1.16$, $p = .793$) (Table 7).

c. was rejected for self-ratings on the Supervisory Behavior Development Questionnaire ($t = 4.02$, $p = .02$) (Table 8).

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions from this study and the review of the literature, the following recommendations are made:

1. Intensive inservice workshops on supervision-by-objectives should be conducted for school administrators, supervisors and vocational agriculture teachers utilizing the five-step clinical supervision model.

2. Vocational agriculture teachers and school administrators should be inserviced on the availability and use of instructional packets that are written and based on performance objectives.

3. At the preservice and inservice levels, school administrators and supervisors should be instructed to place emphasis on evaluation of teacher performance based on the product (result) of the instruction, rather than style and process.

4. Teacher educators and cooperating teachers need to utilize clinical supervision strategies (product specification) in supervising student teachers in order to develop goal-setting and evaluation habits of new teachers.

5. School administrators, supervisors, and teachers should set clearly stated short and long term goals and objectives, communicate these objectives to each other and to students and evaluate teacher and student performance on the basis of achievement of these goals and objectives.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This experimental study should be replicated.

2. A study should be designed to develop an inservice program for school administrators, teachers, and parents on goal setting in educational institutions.

VIII. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Appendix A - Bibliography
Appendix B - Letter to Superintendents
Appendix C - Initial Letter to Principals
Appendix D - Letter to Principals
Appendix E - Letter to Beginning Teachers
Appendix F - Teacher Consent Form
Appendix G - Letter to Principals - Workshop
Appendix H - Workshop Program
Appendix I - Supervisory Procedures to Follow
Appendix J - Principal Timetable
Appendix K - Teacher Timetable
Appendix L - Teacher Report Form
Appendix M - Teacher Log of Activities
Appendix N - Principal Log of Activities
Appendix O - Letter to Principals - Procedures to Follow in Product Specification (Group 1)
Appendix P - Product Specification - Teacher Information
Appendix Q - Letter to Principals - Procedures to Follow in Process Specification (Group 2)
Appendix R - Process Specification - Teacher Information
Appendix S - Letter to Principals - Progress Report
Appendix T - Letter to Teachers
Appendix U - Letter to Principals - Student Surveys
Appendix V - Letter to Principals - Survey Forms
Appendix W - Supervisor/Principal Information
Appendix X - Teacher Information
Appendix Y - Questionnaires
1. Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire
2. Job Objectives Questionnaire
3. Likert Profile of a School Questionnaire
4. Student Perception of Teacher Style
5. Achievement Test

Appendix Z - Thank You Letter

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelman, Frank W. "Teachers Conquer Those First-Year Blues," Journal of the American Vocational Association. Vol. 54, No. 3, March 1979, pp. 37-38.

Agricultural Education Magazine. Vol. 28, No. 3, September 1955, pp. 52, 55, 56, 60, 68.

Almack, John C. The Beginning Teacher. Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1928.

Anderton, J. D. The First Two Years. Curriculum and Research Branch, Education Department, Western Australia, 1976.

Avent, Joseph E. Beginning Teacher. Jos. E. Avent, Publisher, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1932.

Ayer, Fred C. and A. S. Barr. The Organization of Supervision. D. Appleton and Co., Inc., New York, 1928, pp. 7-37.

Barr, Arvil S. "Measurements and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Review of Educational Research. Vol. 14, June 1945, pp. 1-5.

Barr, Arvil S. "Supervision," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Revised Edition, Macmillion, New York, 1952, pp. 1371-1373.

Barr, A. S. and Mabel Rudisill. "Inexperienced Teachers Who Fail--and Why," The Nation's Schools. Vol. 5, February 1930, pp. 30-34.

Barr, A. S. and Nels O. Rappen. "The Attitudes of Teachers Toward Supervision," Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. III, June 1935, pp. 243-289.

Barrett, Leverne A. "Effectiveness of Leadership Development Program for Vocational-Technical School Administrators." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1978.

Baughman, M. Dale. Junior High School Staff Personnel--Their Preparation and Professional Growth. The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., Danville, Illinois, 1966.

Bennie, William A. Cooperation for Better Student Teaching. Burgess Publishing Co., Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1966.

Bennie, William A. Supervising Clinical Experiences in the Classroom. Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1972.

Blair, Lois C. and Paul Erickson. The Student Teacher's Experiences in the Community. The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 21, 1964.

Bonner, Henry L. "The Relationship of the Use of Non-School Agencies to Experience and Success of Teachers in Teaching Vocational Agriculture in Alabama." Doctoral Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, June 1953.

Borg, Walter. Moving Toward Effective Teacher Education--One Man's Perspective. 51st Faculty Honor Lecture, Faculty Association and The University Press, Utah State University, 1975.

Borg, Walter, Marjorie L. Kelley, Philip Langer, and Meredith Gall. A Micro-Teaching Approach to Teacher Education. Macmillan Agricultural Services, Inc., Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1970.

Bowley, R. L. Teaching Without Tears. Philosophical Library, New York, New York, 1967.

Boyan, Norman J. and Willis D. Copeland. Instructional Supervision Training Program. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1978.

Brockhausen, Anna. "Teachers' Estimates of the Methods Used to Inspire Professional Interest," Elementary School Teacher. Vol. VIII, January 1908, pp. 249-264.

Brunner, Henry S. "Criteria for Evaluating Programs of Preparation for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture." Doctoral Thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1943.

Burton, William H. "The Teacher's Morale as an Important Factor in Teaching Success," California Journal of Elementary Education. Vol. VII, May 1938, pp. 218-226.

Burton, William H. and Leo J. Brueckner. Supervision: A Social Process. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1955, p. 5.

Dussault, Gilles. A Theory of Supervision in Teacher Education. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970.

Edwards, Helen E. Building Good Relationships: A Major Role of the College Supervisor. The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 16, 1961.

Efferson, Carlos A. "Pretraining Records and Activities of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Louisiana As Related to Teaching Success." Master's Thesis, Louisiana State University, 1940.

Elementary Education Committee. Educating our Children's Teachers. Department of Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 1954, p. 6.

Elsbree, W. S. and E. E. Reutter. Staff Personnel in the Public Schools. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1954, pp. 230-231.

Evans, Ellis D. Transition to Teaching. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, New York, 1976.

Feyereisen, Kathryn and Verna L. Dieckman. Guiding Student Teaching Experiences. The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 1, 1952, p. 14.

Foster, Walter S. and Norman C. Jacobs. The Beginning Elementary School Teacher--Problems and Issues. Burgess Publishing Co., 1970.

Fyfield, J. A., S. M. Taylor and R. P. Tisher. The Induction of Beginning Teachers in Australia. Final draft of Research Report on Stage II of the Teacher Induction Project, Monash University, 1978.

Guss, Carolyn. "How is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership. Vol. XIX, November 1961, pp. 99-102.

Haefele, Donald L. "How to Evaluate Thee, Teacher--Let Me Count the Ways," Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 61, No. 5, January 1980, pp. 349-352.

Harrington, W. E. "First Year Teachers and Supervision," Ohio School Journal. Vol. XXXIX, February 1961, pp. 32-33.

Heger, Herbert K. First Steps in Secondary Teaching--From Survival to Confidence. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1973.

Heidelbach, Ruth, Editor. Iris M. Elfenbein, Louise Berman and Jessie A. Roderick, Willis D. Copeland and Norman J. Boyan. Developing Supervisory Practice. Association of Teacher Educators, Bulletin No. 41, 1975.

Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. (3rd edition). Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1977.

Howe, Kenneth E. "Real Experiences in Teacher Education," School Educative. May 1944, pp. 47-48.

Howell, David L. et al. Energy Conservation in the Home and on the Farm. Department of Agricultural Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 1980.

Ishler, Richard E., Editor. Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Potpourri of Perspectives. The Association of Teacher Educators, Bulletin No. 38, 1974.

Juergenson, Elwood M. "The Relationship Between Success in Teaching Vocational Agriculture and Ability to Make Sound Judgements as Measured by Selected Instruments." Doctoral Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University.

Keene, Melvin. Beginning Secondary School Teacher's Guide, Some Problems and Suggested Solutions. Harper and Row, New York, New York, 1969.

King, Franklin J. and Clyde B. Knight. "Workshops Push Survival Techniques," Journal of the American Vocational Association. Vol. 54, No. 3, March 1979, pp. 38-39.

Knickerbocker, Irving. "Leadership--A Conception and Some Implications," Journal of Social Issues. Vol. IV, Summer 1948, pp. 23-40.

Krebs, Henry C. Being a Good Teacher. Hinds, Hayden and Eldredge, Inc., Philadelphia, PA, 1918.

Kyte, George C. "This is the Kind of Supervision Teachers Welcome and Want," The Nation's Schools. Vol. XLVIII, July 1951, pp. 33-34.

Lagana, Joseph F. What Happens to the Attitudes of Beginning Teachers. The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., Danville, Illinois, 1970.

Lamb, Marion M. Your First Year of Teaching. South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1956.

Lane, David J. "Teacher-Supervisor Relationships," High Points. Vol. 35, February 1953, pp. 29-35.

Lindsey, Margaret and Associates. Inquiry into Teaching Behavior of Supervisors in Teacher Education Laboratories. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1969.

Lortie, Dan C. School-Teacher, A Sociological Study. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. McGraw Book Co., New York, 1962, p. 4.

McClay, David R. "A Determination of the Relationship Between Experience Obtained in Training and Subsequent Performance in Teaching for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture and an Examination of the Process Used." Doctoral Thesis, Cornell University, 1951.

Meers, Gary D. "Moving Beyond Cynicism--The First Step Toward Effective Teaching," Journal of the American Vocational Association. Vol. 54, No. 3, March 1979, pp. 22-24.

Merriman, Pearl and Gladys M. Fair. Helping Student Teachers Through Evaluation. The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 2, 1953.

McNeil, John D. Toward Accountable Teachers, Their Appraisal and Improvement. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1971.

Miller, George F. Letters from a Hard-Boiled Teacher to his Half-Baked Son. Chas. H. Potter & Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., 1931.

Murphy, Patricia D. and Donald W. Priebe. A Workshop: The World of the First Year Teacher. Final Report. North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota; North Dakota State Board for Vocational Education, Bismarck, North Dakota, May 1974.

National Education Association. First Year Teachers in 1954-55. Washington, D. C., February 1956, p. 4.

National Education Association. Teacher Personnel Practices, 1950-51; Appointment and Termination of Services. Washington, D. C., 1952, p. 23.

Norton, M. S. "Are Classroom Visits Worthwhile?" Clearing House. September 1960, pp. 41-43.

Nye, Ivan. The Relationship of Certain Factors to County Agent Success. Research Bulletin 498, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, June 1952.

Oberholtzer, E. E. "Next Steps in Supervision," Address and Proceedings. National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1922, pp. 1439-1455.

Reavis, Charles A. Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision. Fastback No. 111, The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, 1978.

Reilly, Howard E. Student Teaching: Two Years After. The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 24, 1965.

Ryan, Kevin, Editor. Contributions by John Canfield, Linda Corman, Gary Cornog, Wylie Crawford, Eleanor Fuke and Gail Richardson. Don't Smile Until Christmas. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1970.

Sandberg, Herbert H. "Beginning Teachers' and Supervisors' Appraisals of Selected Supervisory Techniques." Doctoral Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, September 1963.

Sasman, E. H., Editor. "Ways of Working to Bring About Desired Change in Teacher Education," 1952 Yearbook. The Association for Student Teaching, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, PA, 1952.

Schwarz, E. Terry. "A Study of Beginning Teachers--Problems Encountered and Services Sought." Doctoral Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, June 1956.

Seeley, David S. "Reducing the Confrontation Over Teacher Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 61, No. 4, December 1979, pp. 248-251.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. Handbook for Effective Department Leadership. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1977.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1971.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt. Supervision: Human Perspectives. (2nd Edition). McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1979.

Shannon, J. R. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Supervision," Educational Method. Vol. 16, October 1936, pp. 9-14.

Shelley, Paul A. "Better Orientation for New Teachers," School Review. Vol. LX, March 1952, p. 157.

Sledge, George W. 'Relationship Between Some Pre-teaching Characteristics and Subsequent Performance of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture." Doctoral Thesis, Michigan State College, 1954.

Spears, Harold. Improving the Supervision of Instruction. Prentice Hall, Inc., 1953, p. 443.

Spillane, Robert R. and Dorothy Levenson. Management by Objectives in Schools. Fastback No. 115, The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, 1978.

Strickland, Everet C. "A Survey and Appraisal of Orientation Programs for New Teachers in Elementary and Secondary Schools of Ohio." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1955.

Tisher, Robert P. "Teacher Induction: An Aspect of the Education and Professional Development of Teachers," A paper presented for the National Conference "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research," Research and Development, Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, Austin, January 1979.

Thomas, M. Donald. Performance Evaluation of Educational Personnel. The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, 1979.

Thompson, Sydney. Motivation of Teachers. Prepared by ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, published by Association of California School Administrators, Burlingame, California, 1979.

Torrence, Andrew P. "A Study of the Relationship of Certain Competencies to Success in Teaching Vocational Agriculture." Doctoral Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1954.

Torrence, Andrew P. "Prediction of Vocational Agriculture Teacher Success," Agricultural Education Magazine. Vol. 27, No. 11, May 1955, pp. 259, 263.

Warriner, E. C. "The Most Efficient Service Which Supervisors Can Render," Addresses and Proceedings. National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1913, pp. 296-317.

Wellinger, Robert C. "Adjusting to Work After Training," School Review. LX, October 1952, citing "The First Three Years of Teaching," p. 390.

Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950, p. 10.

Wright, R. E., Editor. Philip L. Hosford, Robert A. Roth, I. V. Ahnell, Elizabeth S. Manera and Michael P. Wolfe. Inservice Education Programs to Improve Teaching Competence. Association of Teacher Educators, Bulletin 39, 1975.

Yauch, Wilbur A., Martin H. Bartels and Emmet Morris. The Beginning Teacher. Henry Holt and Company, New York, New York, 1955.

Zook, Lester M. "The Relation of Farm Experience to Success in Teaching Vocational Agriculture. A Study of Forty Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Pennsylvania." Master's Thesis, The Pennsylvania State College, August 1933.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: February 4, 1980

From: Dr. Patrick Lynch P.D.L.
Dr. David L. Howell D.L.H.
Mr. Robert A. Martin R.A.M.

To: Superintendent

Re: Study on Supervision of Teachers

The principal of your high school is being asked to participate in a study concerning the supervision of beginning teachers of agriculture. The enclosed materials are copies of the information sent to the principal.

It is our hope that upon reading this information, you will encourage your secondary school principal to participate in this study.

Your assistance in this project is appreciated.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: February 4, 1980

From: Dr. Patrick Lynch, Professor, Educational Administration P.D.L.
Dr. David L. Howell, Assistant Professor, Agricultural Education D.L.H.
Robert A. Martin, Instructor, Agricultural Education R.A.M.

To:

Subject: Study Involving the Supervision of Beginning Teachers

Because beginning teachers have problems that go beyond those of experienced teachers, there is a need to consider, study, and act on various aspects of the beginning teacher experience that could have a bearing on success as well as commitment to teaching. One of these areas is that of supervision.

As a part of the effort to assist beginning teachers of agriculture to adjust to and become committed to their profession, the Department of Agricultural Education plans to conduct an experiment in the area of supervision of beginning teachers of agriculture. Your school has been randomly selected to participate in this experiment. This letter is being sent to ask your permission and cooperation in carrying out this study.

The study entails randomly selecting 30 public school administrators with beginning teachers of agriculture under their supervision. The administrators will be randomly assigned one of two groups each of which will be asked to attend a one-day workshop and develop techniques to use in supervising beginning teachers of agriculture. Administrators participating in this study will receive a $100 honorarium plus expenses for attending the workshop.

In addition, all administrators will receive the same teaching materials (free of charge) to give to their beginning vocational agriculture teachers and their 11th and 12th grade agriculture students. The instructional materials, Energy Conservation in Agriculture, will be used as the instructional base in this study.

You will be assisted in the use of specific supervisory techniques. These techniques will be used in working with your vocational agriculture teacher. Additionally, you will

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

be asked to complete post-experimental survey forms to assess the supervisory style used. Along with this, vocational agriculture students will take an achievement test on the subject matter.

Students will also complete a questionnaire on the assessment of their vocational agriculture instructor's teaching style.

The study is to be conducted in February and March, 1980. The instructional unit should be completed in a three-week period of time.

Would you please complete the attached form giving your consent to become involved in this study and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope? If you agree to participate, you will soon receive complete details about the project.

We appreciate your thoughtful consideration and we hope to hear from you in the very near future.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques
on
Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture

_____ I agree to participate in this study and want more information sent by return mail.

_____ I cannot participate in this study.

Signed _____

School _____

Please return this form in the enclosed envelope by February 15, 1980.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

February 6, 1980

Thank you for your positive response concerning participation in the study on supervision of beginning teachers of agriculture.

The workshop that you are to attend is scheduled for Thursday, March 6, 1980. Please note that this is a one-day workshop! The workshop will be held in Room 306 of the Keller Conference Building and will begin at 9:30 a.m. and end by 3:00 p.m.

You should stop at the visitor's booth near the Keller Building and ask for a temporary parking permit for the day.

It is not necessary to bring any materials with you.

Thank you again for agreeing to participate in this study. I am looking forward to meeting you on March 6.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Martin
Instructor

RM:v

P.S. A complete program will be sent to you prior to March 6.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

February 6, 1980

Thank you for your positive response concerning participation in the study on supervision of beginning teachers of agriculture.

The workshop that you are to attend is scheduled for Friday, March 7, 1980. Please note that this is a one-day workshop. The workshop will be held in Room 306 of the Keller Conference Building and will begin at 9:30 a.m. and end by 3:00 p.m.

You should stop at the visitor's booth near the Keller Building and ask for a temporary parking permit for the day.

It is not necessary to bring any materials with you.

Thank you again for agreeing to participate in this study. I am looking forward to meeting you on March 7.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Martin
Instructor

RM:v

P.S. A complete program will be sent to you prior to March 7.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Your school administrator has agreed to participate in a study concerning supervision of instruction. You are being asked to cooperate in helping conduct this study by using prescribed teaching materials and completing an evaluation form at the conclusion of the study.

The teaching materials concern energy conservation in agriculture. They are free of charge and you will receive sufficient materials for all 11th and 12th grade vocational agriculture students. In addition, you are asked to administer an achievement test on the material. The achievement test will be given at the conclusion of the instruction and these tests and answer sheets will be returned to the Department of Agricultural Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

The teacher evaluation form you will be asked to complete will be sent directly to you and you will be asked to return it to the Department of Agricultural Education upon completion. This form should not be given to your administrator/supervisor.

The information gathered in this study will only be used and interpreted as group data. Your survey form will be identified by code only; not by name. After being analyzed, all raw data will be destroyed.

Your consent is needed for participation in this study. Please complete the enclosed form and return to me as soon as possible. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Your assistance in this project is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Martin
Instructor

RM:v

Title: Supervision of Beginning Teachers

Investigator: Robert A. Martin

Date:

This is to certify that I, _____, hereby agree to participate as a volunteer in a scientific investigation as an authorized part of the education and research program of The Pennsylvania State University under the supervision of Robert A. Martin.

The investigation and my part in it have been defined and fully explained to me by Robert A. Martin and I understand his explanation. The procedures of this study are described on the back of this form and have been discussed with me.

I have been given an opportunity to ask whatever questions I may have had and these questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that I am free to deny any answers to specific items or questions in the questionnaires to be used in this study.

I understand that any data collected will remain confidential with regard to my identity.

I further understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time.

Date: _____ _____
Subject's Signature

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the study to the above subject.

Date: _____ _____
Investigator's Signature

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date : February 27, 1980

To:

From: Robert A. Martin

Re: Study on Supervision

Allow me to state at the outset that I sincerely appreciate your willingness to participate in the study on supervision of beginning teachers. I hope you will find this experience enjoyable and enlightening.

Please find enclosed a copy of the program for the one-day workshop you have agreed to attend. Please note the date, time and location of this meeting.

If you are planning to arrive in State College the night before the workshop, and you would like for me to make hotel arrangements, please contact me at your earliest convenience. (814-863-0443)

Please keep an accurate accounting of your travel and other expenses so that prompt reimbursement can be made.

If you have questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call.

I look forward to meeting you at the workshop.

Enclosure

Workshop on Supervision of Teachers
Thursday, March 6, 1980

Room 306 Keller Building

9:00 a.m. - 9:15 a.m.	Coffee and Donuts Get Acquainted
9:15 a.m. - 9:20 a.m.	Introduction to Workshop Robert A. Martin Project Director
9:20 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	Welcome -- Dr. Gene Love Professor and Head, Ag. Education Dept. Director of Vocational Education
9:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	Communications and Setting the Stage for Supervision Dr. Edgar P. Yoder Assistant Professor of Ag. Education Former School Administrator
10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Explanation of Project Materials Dr. David L. Howell Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education Mr. Robert A. Martin Project Director
11:00 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.	Experimental Procedures & Guidelines Mr. Robert A. Martin Project Director
12:00 Noon	LUNCH - Nittany Lion Inn
1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.	Experimental Procedures & Guidelines Questions and Answers Mr. Robert A. Martin Project Director
2:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	BREAK
2:15 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Evaluation Instruments Robert A. Martin
3:00 p.m.	ADJOURN

Workshop on Supervision of Teachers
Friday, March 7, 1980

Room 306 Keller Building

9:00 a.m. - 9:15 a.m.	Coffee & Donuts Get Acquainted
9:15 a.m. - 9:20 a.m.	Introduction to Workshop Mr. Robert A. Martin Project Director
9:20 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	Welcome -- Dr. Gene Love Professor and Head, Ag. Education Dept. Director of Vocational Education
9:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	Communications & Setting the Stage for Supervision Dr. Edgar P. Yoder Assistant Professor of Ag. Education Former School Administrator
10:30 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.	Explanation and Use of Project Materials Dr. David L. Howell Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education Mr. Robert A. Martin Project Director
12:00 Noon	LUNCH - Nittany Lion Inn
1:15 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.	Experimental Procedures and Guidelines Mr. Robert A. Martin Project Director
2:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	BREAK
2:15 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Evaluation Instruments Robert A. Martin
3:00 p.m.	ADJOURN

Supervision of Teachers
Treatment #1
Product Specification

-- Procedures to Follow --

1. Meet with teachers to give materials and have them return approximately in one week with objectives - product specifications - for the Instructional Unit -- Energy Conservation in Agriculture

2. Pre-observational conference

   Specify what products or results will show learning has occurred.

   What objectives are to be achieved.
   What is to be taught.
   What is to be learned - Cognitive & Psychomotor
   Help specify materials needed and help acquire them.

3. First Observation

4. Post Observation - zero in on 1 or 2 items observed.

5. Second Observation - near end of Instructional Unit.

6. Post Observation - Discussion of the achievement of the objectives, student achievement and activities, evidence of achievement & learning.

   What products resulted.
   What objectives were achieved?
   To what degree were objectives achieved?
   What is the proof of reaching the objectives?

EMPHASIS PUT ON LEARNING. -- PRODUCT
DE-EMPHASIS ON TEACHER, TEACHER STYLE, METHODS, TEACHER ACTIVITY.

7. PRINCIPAL/SUPERVISOR MAINTAIN A LOG OF ACTIVITIES.

SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS
TREATMENT #2
PROCESS SPECIFICATION

-- PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW --

1. GIVE MATERIALS TO TEACHERS. DO NOT GIVE UNUSUAL ATTENTION TO THIS TEACHER. CONTINUE TO SUPERVISE AS YOU HAVE UP TO THIS TIME.

2. FIRST OBSERVATION NEAR APRIL 9.

   USE EVALUTION FORM YOU PRESENTLY USE.
   (PLEASE SEND A COPY OF THE EVALUATION FORM YOU ARE USING IN YOUR SCHOOL TO ROBERT A. MARTIN - PSU AG. ED. DEPARTMENT)

3. EVALUATION CONFERENCE

4. SECOND OBSERVATION NEAR APRIL 30.

   USE EVALUATION FORM YOU PRESENTLY USE.

5. EVALUATION CONFERENCE

6. EVALUATE ON THE BASIS OF TEACHER PREPARATION, TEACHER STYLE OF TEACHING, REACTION OF STUDENTS TO TEACHER, TEACHER RELATIONSHIP TO OTHERS, PERSONALITY, ORGANIZATION, ENTHUSIASM, DEPENDABILITY, INITIATIVE, TACT, RESOURCEFULNESS, SELF-CONFIDENCE, SELF-CONTROL, JUDGMENT, DRESS AND GROOMING, EFFECTIVENESS IN COMMUNICATION, CLASSROOM ATMOSPHERE AND CONTROL, USE OF NEW AND VARIED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, ATTENTION TO INDIVIDUAL NEEDS.

7. PRINCIPAL/SUPERVISOR MAINTAIN A LOG OF ACTIVITIES.

PRINCIPAL/SUPERVISOR GUIDELINES
Product Specification

March 6, 1980

-Timetable-

By March 14th	Meet with teachers and give materials and explain.
By March 21st	Principals and Teachers Meet and Teacher Specifies "Products" of Learning - Objectives - Items to offer as proof of the learning.
By March 28	Begin Lessons In a 2-period/day class Use one period for instruction and one period for student activity 1 unit per week - 3 weeks
By April 9	First Observation and First Post Observation Conference
By April 25	Student Achievement Test and Evaluation
By April 30	Second Observation And Second Post Observation Conference
By May 2	Return Questionnaires
August, 1980	General Report will be shared with you

PRINCIPAL/SUPERVISOR GUIDELINES
Process Specification

March 7, 1980

-Timetable-

By March 14	Give materials to teachers
By March 28	Begin lessons
	1 unit per week - 3 weeks
By April 9	1st Observation & Evaluation Conference
By April 25	Student Achievement Test & Evaluation
By April 30	2nd Observation & Evaluation Conference
By May 2	Return Questionnaires, etc.
August, 1980	General Report will be shared with you

Teacher Timetable

By March 14	Receive materials to teach Conservation of Energy in Agriculture
By March 28	Begin lessons
	1 unit per week - 3 weeks
By April 25	Achievement Test and Evaluation
By May 2	Complete and return questionaires
August, 1980	General report will be shared with you

Teacher Report Form

Date started teaching Energy Conservation in Agriculture:

_____

Date instruction completed: _____

Date Student Achievement Test administered: _____

Date Principal administered student evaluation form:

_____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

RETURN with questionnaires to:

Mr. Robert A. Martin
Room 110 Armsby Building
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

Teacher Log of Activities

Teacher: _____

School: _____

Date	Name of Activity	Comments	Approximate Time Spent

Supervision of Beginning Teachers
Principal/Supervisor Log of Activities

Principal/Supervisor: _____

Teacher: _____

School: _____

Date	Name of Activity	Comments	Approximate Time Spent

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: March 9, 1980

To: Product Specification Principals/Supervisors

From: Robert A. Martin R.A.M.

Prior to your Pre-observational Conference with your teacher of agriculture/horticulture concerning teaching the Energy Conservation in Agriculture, I would like to re-emphasize the procedure that we outlined at our workshop. It is highly important that these procedures be followed as we developed them. Please follow these steps in product specification type of supervision. Remember, emphasis is being placed on the "learning", the product of the teaching; not on the teacher and teacher traits.

1. Pre-observational Conference (In the Teacher's Vo. Ag. Room) In this conference it is important that the teacher specifies what the products or results of the learning will be. It is also important for the teacher to state the objectives to be achieved, specify what is to be taught--cognitive and psychomotor, and specify materials that will be needed and how they will be acquired.

   The supervisor's role is to be supportive and non-threatening. Give the teacher encouragement. Your suggestions might be helpful insofar as strategy is concerned but be careful not to impose your ideas on the teacher. The teacher needs to feel you have a genuine interest in the instructional strategies and objectives he/she has set. State a time you will visit and what you will be looking for.

2. First Observation - Please observe the teacher in a casual way. Do not take forms etc. to the classroom and mark while observing. The teacher should be informed as to when you are coming to observe. Consider 1 or 2 items that will be discussed in the post-observation conference.

3. Post-Observation Conference - Zero in on 1 or 2 items you observed. Consider an objective or objectives the teacher and students were trying to achieve. (Conduct this conference in the Vo. Ag. Room.)

4. Second Observation - The second observation should concentrate on 2 or 3 items as a result of the previous observation. Remember, this is a developmental process and it is leading to the completion of the unit and its objectives.

5. Post-Observation Conference - (Conduct this conference in the Vo. Ag. Room) Discuss the items observed. Discuss the overall achievement of the objectives that were developed for this whole unit, student achievement and activities, evidence of achievement and learning. What resulted from the unit of instruction? Please put an emphasis on the learning. Please do not put an emphasis on the teacher, teacher style, methods, or teacher activity.

6. Student Survey - At the conclusion of this study you are being asked to administer the student survey. This should be done in the absence of the teacher. You may designate someone else to administer this survey - i.e. - guidance counselor. This, in fact, might be better since counselors are always testing students and giving one more is not unusual. We do not want students to get the idea that their survey will be used against the teacher. Whatever you decide, be sure to log it.

7. Enclosed, please find copies of materials sent to your beginning teacher of agriculture.

It is very important that you (the principal/supervisor) do all that you can to develop a very positive environment in using this style of supervision.

Please remember to maintain a log of activities and have your teacher do the same.

If you should have problems or concerns, please do not hesitate to call me at your earliest convenience.

Best regards.

Enclosure

Product Specification - Teacher Information

Pre-observation Conference

In this study, you and your principal/supervisor will meet in a pre-observational conference (in your vo. ag. room) and discuss the instructional unit provided - Energy Conservation in Agriculture. You should come to this conference with your objectives for the unit clearly stated. Use the teacher's manual and decide what it is that you are going to teach, how you are going to teach it and what the students are going to do in the way of student activities.

Teachers should be particularly interested in specifying what the product or results of the learning will be. You should develop both classroom and hands-on activities.

Your supervisor is being asked to make suggestions that will help you get organized. He/she will be basically asking you what you want to do and how you want to do it types of questions.

Both of you will take a look at the objectives and what you hope to accomplish.

First Observation

You and the principal will decide on a time for the first observation. This will be a casual observation and will not include writing any notes down while in the classroom. In this observation 1 or 2 items will be considered.

Post Observation Conference - (In Vo. Ag. Room)

You and your principal will discuss 1 or 2 items observed in the process of teaching a lesson. An emphasis will be placed on the objectives.

Second Observation

The second observation should concentrate on 2 or 3 items as a result of the previous observation. Remember, this is a developmental process and it is leading to the completion of the unit and its objectives.

Post Observation Conference - (Conduct in Vo. Ag. Room)

In this conference, the items observed will be discussed as well as overall student achievement, objectives achieved, and the evidence of learning that took place. What resulted from the unit of instruction? An emphasis will be placed on the learning.

You are asked to keep a log of activities and complete the teacher report form and send both of these back to PSU - Ag. Ed. Department with the questionnaires you will complete. The questionnaires will be sent to you by April 25. There are 3 questionnaires you will complete and these should not be given to anyone else. They must be sent directly to me. These questionnaires will be asking you what you think about this style of supervision.

A student achievement test will be sent to you in mid-April. You should administer this test when the instructional unit is completed. Please return the achievement test as soon as it is completed. It will be scored here at PSU and the results sent to you. Because we are using code numbers, not names, you should record the code numbers of students so that you eventually can give the test results to the students.

Lastly, a 16-question student survey form will be completed by your students. This form asks questions about style of teaching. It does not ask any personal questions. It asks students to rate various student activities they will get involved in during this energy conservation unit and how they liked the way it was presented. This survey will be administered by your principal/supervisor or his/her designee i.e. - counselor, etc.

Please keep in mind that any observation notes taken during this research experiment <u>will not</u> become a part of your personnel file.

Please refer to the attached teacher timetable. You may teach this unit whenever it best fits, but try to finish it prior to May 1st if at all possible.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact your principal or Robert A. Martin.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: March 10, 1980

To: Process Specification Principals/Supervisors

From: Robert A. Martin R.A.M.

As you enter into the procedures of the Study on Supervision of Beginning Teachers, I would like to re-emphasize the various steps that are to be followed as we outlined them at our workshop. It is highly important that these procedures be followed as we developed them.

1. In the next two weeks arrange to give the instructional materials to your teacher and explain their format. Give timetable, teacher report form and teacher log information.

2. Please do not give unusual attention to this teacher. Continue to supervise as you have up to this time.

3. Plan to have your first observation near April 9. Use the evaluation form you presently are using. Please take notes during your visit. Put emphasis on teacher preparation, teacher style, reaction of students to teacher, organization, enthusiasm, etc. (as we had listed them on the procedures-to-follow sheet given to you at the workshop.)

4. Conduct an evaluation conference. Discuss the items mentioned above. Do not discuss other items.

5. Make your second observation by or near April 30 if at all possible. Follow the same procedure.

6. Conduct the second evaluation conference as above.

7. Carefully maintain a log of activities as explained at the workshop.

8 Student Survey - At the conclusion of this study, you are being asked to administer the student survey. This should be done in the absence of the teacher. You may designate someone else to administer this survey, i.e. - guidance counselor. We do not want the students to get the idea that their surveys will be used against the teacher. Whatever you decide, be sure to log it.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

9. Enclosed, please find copies of materials sent to your beginning teacher of agriculture.

10. Please remember to send me the evaluation form you are now using.

If you should have problems or concerns, please do not hesitate to call me at your earliest convenience.

Best regards.

Enclosure

Process Specification - Teacher Information

Please remember that it is highly important that you follow this procedure very carefully.

In this study, you will be given an instructional unit called Energy Conservation in Agriculture. You and your principal/supervisor will discuss the format of the book and how it could be worked into your course of study. After this initial meeting with your principal/supervisor, you will be on your own.

Try to begin your unit of instruction by March 28 if at all possible. (See the attached timetable.) Do not inform your students that this is an experiment or research study.

Around April 9 you will have your first observation and evaluation conference.

The second observation conference will be near the end of April.

You are asked to keep a log of activities and complete the teacher report form and send both of these back to Penn State University, Agricultural Education Department with the questionnaires you will complete.

The questionnaires will be sent to you by April 25. There are 3 questionnaires you will complete and these should not be given to anyone else. They must be sent directly to me.

A student achievement test will be sent to you in mid-April. You should administer this test when the instructional unit is completed. It will be scored here at PSU and the results sent to you. Because we are using code numbers, not names, you should record the code numbers of students so that you eventually can give the test results to the students.

Lastly, a 16-question student survey form will be completed by your students. This form asks questions about how the unit was taught. It does not ask any personal questions. This survey will be administered by your principal/supervisor or his/her designee, i.e. - counselor, etc.

Please keep in mind that any observation notes taken during this research experiment will not become a part of your personnel file.

Please refer to the attached teacher timetable. You may teach this unit whenever it best fits, but try to finish it prior to May 1st if at all possible.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

By this time, I hope that you have had the opportunity to meet with your beginning teacher of vocational agriculture and explain the procedures under which the project on supervision of beginning teachers is to operate.

Please keep in mind that the teacher is free to put the Energy Conservation Unit into his/her curriculum wherever it will best fit and for whatever length of time it is best suited. It is hoped that the entire instructional unit will be completed by the first week in May, if possible.

Do not, however, be alarmed if it goes beyond this date. It is important that the unit is taught; therefore, flexibility is necessary.

The 1st observation should take place about mid-way through teaching the unit and the last observation at the end. (During the last 2 or 3 days)

Please remember to keep a log of all your activities related to this project and send it to me at the conclusion of the study.

I hope that you have been encouraging your teacher to set clear objectives and that you have been positively reinforcing the importance of student performance in an atmosphere that lends encouragement to the teacher.

Near the end of April your teacher should be receiving the Achievement Test and other materials for his/her use. You will be receiving student survey forms and your own forms to complete at approximately the same time.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

Your help is needed in carrying this project to its conclusion. I hope you have found it rewarding to you personally and beneficial to your vocational agriculture/horticulture program. I appreciate your support and interest.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Martin

RM:v

P.S. If you have questions or concerns, please call me at 814-863-0443.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

By this time, I hope that you have had the opportunity to meet with your beginning teacher of vocational agriculture and explain the Energy Conservation in Agriculture Unit and how this project will be conducted.

Please keep in mind that the teacher is free to put the unit into his/her curriculum whenever and wherever it best fits. It is hoped that the entire unit would be completed by the first week in May, if possible. Do not, however, be alarmed if it goes beyond this date.

The 1st observation should take place mid-way through teaching the unit and the last observation at the end. (During the last 2 or 3 days)

Please remember to keep a log of all of your activities related to this project and send it to me at the end of the study. If you haven't already done so, please remember to send a copy of the evaluation forms you presently use at your school. You may send all this material together if you like.

Near the end of April, your teacher will be receiving the Achievement Test and other forms for his/her use. You will be receiving student survey forms and your own forms to complete at approximately the same time.

Your help is needed in carrying this project to its conclusion. Your support and interest is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Martin

RM:v

P.S. If you have questions or concerns, please call me at 814-863-0443.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

To: Beginning Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

From: Robert A. Martin

Re: Study on Supervision

By this time, I hope you have either started the unit on Conservation of Energy in Agriculture or plan to do so in the near future.

Keep in mind that you may fit this unit into your curriculum whenever and wherever you choose for as long as you choose. Those decisions are being left up to you. However, please keep a log of all your activities in this project. The activities, etc. listed in the book are only suggestions. You are not expected to complete all of them. You decide what you and your students should do.

It is hoped that the entire unit will be completed by the first week in May, but do not be concerned if it goes beyond this date.

You will receive the Achievement Test by April 25th. You will also be receiving your survey forms which should be filled out when this project is completed.

If you haven't already done so, please return your consent form to me as soon as possible in the PSU self-addressed envelope sent to you earlier.

Above all, if you have questions or concerns, please call me at your earliest convenience.

Your help is needed in carrying this project to its conclusion. I appreciate your support and interest.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Martin

Robert A. Martin

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: April 28, 1980

To: Principals/Supervisors

From: Robert A. Martin

Re: Student Perception of Teacher Style

Enclosed, please find copies of the student survey on teacher style that you have agreed to administer to students having been taught the Energy Conservation Unit.

The students are to circle one response per question on a nine-point scale. Please read the instructions to the students and make sure they understand them.

It is very important that the proper identification be placed on the survey form. The same numbers that the students used on the Achievement Tests should be used on this survey. The teacher will have a record of these numbers so you can get them from him/her.

As soon as the surveys are completed, please return the survey to the following address:

Robert A. Martin
110 Armsby Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Enclosure

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: May 5, 1980

To: Principals/Supervisors

From: Robert A. Martin

Re: Survey Forms on Supervision

Enclosed, please find the survey forms you have agreed to complete. Complete these forms considering your vantage point and how you feel about your supervision.

Please complete these forms and return to me in the enclosed envelope at your earliest convenience. These forms will take some time to complete, so be sure to allow yourself time to consider the questions carefully.

Be sure to return the Student Perception of Teacher Style and your log of activities if you haven't already done so.

Let me take this opportunity to thank you very much for your help in this project. You will receive a report of this research when analysis of the data is complete.

Again, thank you. Best regards for an enjoyable and relaxing summer.

Enclosure

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to learn more about how students, teachers, school administrators and others can best work together. The aim is to use the information to help make teaching and supervision of instruction more satisfactory and productive.

If the results are to be helpful, it is important that you answer each question as thoroughly and frankly as possible. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

The answers on the questionnaire are to be processed by a computer which will summarize the responses in statistical form so that individuals cannot be identified. To insure complete confidentiality, please do not write your name anywhere on the survey form.

It is very important that you return this survey immediately upon completion to the Agricultural Education Department, The Pennsylvania State University.

Please complete the demographic data form.

General Instructions

This questionnaire has three sections. Please be sure to read the instructions carefully before starting to answer the questions. Answer these questions as to how you perceive the job you do.

SUPERVISOR DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

A. School _____

B. Your highest educational level:

____ (1) B.S.
____ (2) M.S./M.Ed.
____ (3) Ed. Specialist
____ (4) D.Ed./Ph.D.

C. Certification status:

____ (1) Intern Teacher
____ (2) Instructional I
____ (3) Instructional II
____ (4) Other (please specify)
a.
b.
c.

D. Sex:

____ (1) Male
____ (2) Female

E. Age (check one):

____ (1) Under 22
____ (2) 22 to 25
____ (3) 26 to 30
____ (4) 31 to 35
____ (5) 36 to 40
____ (6) 41 to 45
____ (7) 46 to 50
____ (8) 51 to 55
____ (9) Over 55

F. Years of teaching experience (check one):

____ (1) Less than 1 year
____ (2) 1 to 5 years
____ (3) 6 to 10 years
____ (4) 11 to 15 years
____ (5) 16 to 20 years
____ (6) Over 20 years

G. Years of administrative experience (check one):

____ (1) Less than 1 year
____ (2) 1 to 5 years
____ (3) 6 to 10 years
____ (4) 11 to 15 years
____ (5) 16 to 20 years
____ (6) Over 20 years

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to learn more about how students, teachers, school principals and others can best work together. The aim is to use the information to help make teaching more satisfactory and productive.

If the results are to be helpful, it is important that you answer each question as thoroughly and frankly as possible. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

The answers on the questionnaire are to be processed by a computer which will summarize the responses in statistical form so that individuals cannot be identified. To insure complete confidentiality, please do not write your name anywhere on the survey form.

It is very important that you return this survey immediately upon completion to the Agricultural Education Department, The Pennsylvania State University.

Please complete the demographic data form.

General Instructions

This questionnaire has three sections. Please be sure to read the instructions carefully before starting to answer the questions.

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

A. School _____

B. Your highest educational level:

____ (1) B.S.
____ (2) M.S.
____ (3) Ed. Specialist
____ (4) D.Ed./Ph.D.

C. Certification Status:

____ (1) Intern Teacher
____ (2) Instructional I
____ (3) Instructional II
____ (4) Other (please specify)
a.
b.
c.

D. Sex:

____ (1) Male
____ (2) Female

E. Age (check one):

____ (1) Under 22
____ (2) 22 to 25
____ (3) 26 to 30
____ (4) 31 to 35
____ (5) 36 to 40
____ (6) 41 to 45
____ (7) 46 to 50
____ (8) 51 to 55
____ (9) Over 55

F. Years of experience in education (check one):

____ (1) Less than 1 year
____ (2) 1 to 5 years
____ (3) 6 to 10 years
____ (4) 11 to 15 years
____ (5) 16 to 20 years
____ (6) Over 20 years

APPENDIX Y1

MY SUPERVISOR

Instructions

A. READ each item carefully.

B. THINK about how frequently your supervisor engages in the behavior.

C. DECIDE whether he/she (1) ALWAYS,
(2) OFTEN,
(3) OCCASIONALLY,
(4) SELDOM, or
(5) NEVER acts as described by the item.

D. CIRCLE the appropriate number to show the answer you have selected.

1.	He/she encourages overtime work.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	He/she tries out his/her new ideas on employees.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	He/she lets group members know what is expected of them.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	He/she expresses appreciation when one of us does a good job.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	He/she rules with an iron hand.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	He/she encourages the use of uniform procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	He/she is easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	He/she criticizes poor work.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	He/she talks about how much should be done.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	He/she encourages unenthusiastic employees to greater effort.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	He/she waits for his/her teachers to puch new ideas before he/she does.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	He/she stands up for his/her teachers even though it makes him/her unpopular.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	He/she assigns teachers under him/her to particular tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	He/she makes his/her attitudes clear to the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	He/she rejects suggestions for changes.	1	2	3	4	5

16.	He/she asks for sacrifices from his/her teachers for the good of the entire school.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	He/she changes the duties of teachers under him/her without first talking it over with them.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	He/she treats people under him/her without considering their feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	He/she insists that his/her people follow standard ways of doing things in every detail.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	He/she sees to it that people under him/her are working up to their limits.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	He/she refuses to explain his/her actions.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	He/she acts without consulting his/her faculty first.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	He/she offers new approaches to problems.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	He/she makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	He/she insists that he/she be informed on decisions made by teachers under him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	He/she schedules the work to be done.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	He/she treats all his/her faculty as his/her equal.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	He/she lets teachers do their work the way they think best.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	He/she stresses being the best school.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	He/she maintains definite standards of performance.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	He/she makes those under him/her feel at ease when talking with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	He/she "needles" people under him/her for greater effort.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	He/she decides in detail what shall be done and how it shall be done.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	He/she is friendly and can be easily approached.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	He/she asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	He/she puts suggestions that are made by people under him/her into operation.	1	2	3	4	5

37.	He/she emphasizes meeting of deadlines.	1	2	3	4	5	
38.	He/she asks teachers who are slow to work harder.	1	2	3	4	5	
39.	He/she gets the approval of his/her faculty on important matters before going ahead.	1	2	3	4	5	
40.	He/she emphasizes the quantity of work.	1	2	3	4	5	
41.	He/she explains the way tasks should be carried out.	1	2	3	4	5	

######

The following statements are related to your relationship with your supervisor. Read each statement, then circle the number indicating how true or untrue you believe each statement to be on the basis of the following scale:

(1) DEFINITELY NOT TRUE
(2) NOT TRUE
(3) SLIGHTLY NOT TRUE
(4) UNCERTAIN
(5) SLIGHTLY TRUE
(6) TRUE
(7) DEFINITELY TRUE

42.	Your supervisor would personally pay you a compliment if you did outstanding work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43.	You would receive a reprimand from your supervisor if you were late in coming to work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44.	Your supervisor would lend a sympathetic ear if you had a complaint.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45.	Your supervisor would see that you will eventually go as far as you would like to go in this organization, if your work is consistently above average.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46.	Your supervisor would get on you if your work was not as good as the work of others in your school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47.	Your supervisor would recommend that you be promoted if your work was better than others who were otherwise equally qualified.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48.	Your supervisor would tell his/her superior if your work was outstanding.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

49. Your supervisor would give you a reprimand (written or verbally) if your work was consistently below acceptable standards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. Your supervisor would recommend that you get no pay increase if your work was below standard.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. Your supervisor would give you special recognition if your work performance was especially good.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52. Your supervisor would show a great deal of interest if you suggested a new and better way of doing things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53. Your supervisor would do all he/she could to help you if you were having problems in your work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54. Your supervisor would recommend that you not be promoted to a higher level job if your performance was only average.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#######

APPENDIX Y2

JOB OBJECTIVES

As employees, each of us has certain objectives that are part of our work. Sometimes, these objectives are spelled out in detail; other times, the objectives are simply intuitively "understood." The following statements refer to your job, and to the objectives that are associated with your job. Read each statement, then circle the number indicating how true or untrue you believe each statement to be on the basis of the following scale:

(1) DEFINITELY NOT TRUE
(2) NOT TRUE
(3) SLIGHTLY NOT TRUE
(4) UNCERTAIN
(5) SLIGHTLY TRUE
(6) TRUE
(7) DEFINITELY TRUE

1.	The administration here wants to know whether I set objectives for my job or not.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	My objectives are clear and well-defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I control the resources necessary to achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	My superior dictates my job objectives to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Writing objectives is only needless paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	I'm fully committed to achieving my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	If I don't achieve my objectives, I will receive a reprimand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Achieving my objectives is very challenging.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	My pay is more likely to be increased if I achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	I have a feeling of accomplishment when I achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	I have no trouble knowing if my objectives have been achieved or not.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	My supervisor gives me more recognition when I achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	My administration makes it clear that defining job objectives is favorably regarded.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	I accept the need to meet my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15. I have a feeling of disappointment when I don't achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Writing objectives takes too much time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. It is easy to achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. If I don't achieve my objectives, my supervisor increases his control over me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Achieving my objectives has my full commitment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I control the specification of my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. My chances for promotion have nothing to do with the accomplishment of objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. My supervisor will "get on my back" if I fail to achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. My objectives are very ambiguous and unclear.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. My superior and I set objectives together.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I have the support I need to accomplish my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I have a feeling of inner pride when I achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I believe in the significance of my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. My superior will compliment me if I achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. My objectives seldom require my full interest and effort.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Pay increases have nothing to do with the accomplishment of objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Job objectives only get in the way of the really significant parts of my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. There is a very competitive atmosphere toward achieving objectives here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. My supervisor will reprimand me if I'm not making progress toward my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. My objectives are very concrete.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

35. Writing objectives reduces the amount of flexibility in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. I lack the authority to accomplish my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I do not participate in defining my own objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. I'm committed to the value of my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. If I don't achieve my objectives, I am displeased with myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. Achieving my objectives is quite a challenge.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. Achieving my objectives increases my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. It takes more time to write objectives than it is worth.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. I always have knowledge of my progress toward my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. I seldom get a compliment if I achieve my objective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. My supervisor lets me establish my own objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. My supervisor lets me know how pleased he/she is if I achieve my objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. Sometimes, I don't know if my objectives have been accomplished or not.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. Writing objectives reduces my ability to control the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. My objectives deserve my full commitment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. When my objectives require coordination, I usually get the help I need.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

######

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
102 ARMSBY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Agriculture
Department of Agricultural Education

Area Code 814
863-0443

Date: April 28, 1980

To: Principals/Supervisors

From: Robert A. Martin RAM'

Re: Student Perception of Teacher Style

Enclosed, please find copies of the student survey on teacher style that you have agreed to administer to students having been taught the Energy Conservation Unit.

The students are to circle one response per question on a nine-point scale. Please read the instructions to the students and make sure they understand them.

It is very important that the proper identification be placed on the survey form. The same numbers that the students used on the Achievement Tests should be used on this survey. The teacher will have a record of these numbers so you can get them from him/her.

As soon as the surveys are completed, please return the survey to the following address:

Robert A. Martin
110 Armsby Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Enclosure

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

Likert Profile of a School

Principal's Form

Teacher's Form

Copyright Material

Distributed by

Rensis Likert Associates, Inc.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHER STYLE

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to learn more about how students, teachers, school principals and others can best work together.

This survey concerns teacher style and is asking for your opinion. If the results are to be helpful, it is important that you answer each question as completely and as frankly as possible. This is <u>not</u> a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

The answers on the survey are processed by computers which summarize the responses as a group. Individual responses cannot be identified. <u>Please</u> do not write your name anywhere on the survey form.

The survey must be given to your principal as soon as it is completed.

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHER STYLE

Instructions

A. Read each item carefully.

B. Think about your response.

C. Circle the number that best describes the style of your teacher.

Example:

The teacher

1 2 3	4 5 6	(7) 8 9
treats me like a child.	treats me like an adult.	treats me like a person.

In the above example, the student thought on a scale of 1 to 9 number 7 respresented how her teacher treated her.

Circle only ONE number per question. There are 16 questions.

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHER STYLE (SPOTS)

1. THE TEACHER:

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Makes you do what he/she wants you to most of the time.	Makes you do what he/she wants you to sometimes.	Lets you make your own decisions most of the time.

2. THE TEACHER:

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Doesn't like to talk about any subject that isn't part of your course.	Talks about your course subject a lot but encourages the discussion of other matters.	Likes to talk about different subjects and is interested in your personal opinions.

3. THE STUDENTS IN OUR CLASS:

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Only speak when the teacher asks them a question	Feel free to ask the teacher questions.	Feel free to speak up at almost any time.

4. WHEN THE TEACHER SAYS SOMETHING YOU DON'T AGREE WITH:

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
You try not to start an argument and feel that it's not your job to tell him he's wrong.	You tell why you disagree when the teacher asks you to.	You feel free to discuss and argue your point of view whether the teacher asks or not.

5. THE TEACHER:

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Usually bases his/her opinions on what the book says or what the principal says.	Usually gives you another point of view in addition to what the book says.	Tells you that books, teachers, principals and customs are not always right.

76

6. IF YOU WERE TO CALL YOUR TEACHER BY HIS/HER FIRST NAME:

1 2 3

He/she wouldn't like it and tell you not to do it.

4 5 6

He/she would tell you that it's alright to call him/her by his/her first name outside of school but that he/she would prefer you to call him/her by his/her last name while he/she is teaching.

7 8 9

He/she wouldn't mind at all.

7. THE TEACHER:

1 2 3

Never tells jokes while he/she is teaching and does not like it when the students joke around.

4 5 6

Sometimes tells a joke or a humorous story to get a point across.

7 8 9

Always tells funny stories and encourages the students to tell about funny things that have happened to them.

8. THE TEACHER SPENDS A LOT OF TIME:

1 2 3

Telling you about tests, grades, and about how the course is planned.

4 5 6

Giving you an idea about tests, grades, and the course but not too much time giving you the details.

7 8 9

Asking you to make your own decisions about tests, grades, the course plan or group projects.

9. WHEN WE ARE WORKING ON A GROUP PROJECT OR IN A COMMITTEE, THE TEACHER:

1 2 3

Tells us exactly what to do.

4 5 6

Suggests ways that the project might be handled.

7 8 9

Lets the group members decide how the project should be handled.

10. THE TEACHER USUALLY:

1 2 3

Makes all the students do the same thing in class (working studying).

4 5 6

Makes some students work on projects and some students study, depending on how far behind they are.

7 8 9

Lets the students do what they like as long as they complete the number of projects or chapters assigned by the end of the week.

11. WHEN YOU GET ANGRY AT THE TEACHER:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
You usually hold it in because the teacher would punish any show of anger.			You feel that you can tell the teacher why you're angry.			You feel that you could show anger without the teacher becoming angry.		

12. THE TEACHER:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Acts like a teacher all of the time.			Acts like a teacher most of the time but sometimes seems more like a friend.			Acts like a friend more than he/she acts like a teacher.		

13. THE FIRST THING THE TEACHER DOES WHEN HE/SHE COMES INTO THE ROOM:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Is to tell you to be quiet so that he/she can take attendance.			Is to take attendance and ask you why some students are absent (if they are sick, etc.).			Is to let you start your project studying and then takes attendance while you're working.		

14. IN THIS CLASS, HOMEWORK:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Is assigned every day and must be handed in the next day.			Is divided between work which is due every day and a few long-term projects each term.			Usually consists of long-term project.		

15 IN OUR CLASS, PUPILS WORK TOGETHER IN A GROUP OR ON A COMMITTEE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Never.			Sometimes.			A great deal.		

16. WHEN THERE IS WORK WHICH HAS TO BE DONE WITH ANOTHER STUDENT, WE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Are usually told with whom to work.			Can sometimes choose our own partner.			Can usually decide with whom we want to work.		

78